

Remarks

Further to the Examiner's suggestion, independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to clarify, as best shown in figures 1, 2, 4, 5, 11 and 15 that the male connector body and the integral spring fingers thereof are a single monolithic element.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 9-10, 12-19 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Arcykiewicz* in view of *Nelson*. The Examiner states that *Arcykiewicz* has each of the claimed elements except a first spring and or related features thereto on an outer diameter of the sleeve, for which *Nelson* is supplied.

The *Arcykiewicz* spring fingers (*Nelson* has no spring fingers, whatsoever) and connector body are a multiple part assembly that has a locking ring 22 from which the spring fingers 24 project outward. The locking ring 22 is mounted upon the connector half 20 (sleeve) that is screwed into the threaded section 10 of the adapter 27 (male connector body). Because the spring fingers 24 and locking ring 22 from which they extend are a separate component from the adapter 27 (male connector body), the cited references fail to teach, disclose or suggest the monolithic connector body with spring fingers extending therefrom as now claimed.

Further, as clearly shown in specification figures 1-6 and 11 and described in paragraphs 28 and 29 (application publication US20050164552) of the specification detailed description, the spring fingers 7 extend from a monolithic connector body 5, the spring fingers 7 biased, via an inward projection of the spring fingers, to provide an interference fit over and against the outer diameter surface (the threads 3). In complete contrast, the *Arcykiewicz* device discloses an elaborate mechanical linkage between spring fingers 24 that are outwardly biased and a slidable coupling sleeve 21 having inner surfaces that engage the outwardly biased spring fingers 24, overcoming the outward bias of the spring fingers 24 and forcing them inward until the coupling sleeve is moved longitudinally away from the spring fingers 24, allowing the spring fingers 24 outward bias to return the spring fingers outward (col. 4, Ln 48-52).

Applicant respectfully submits that it is beyond any rational “broadest possible” interpretation by one skilled in the art to suggest that the plainly outward biased spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz*, whose only inward action is via the mechanical operation of the slidable coupling sleeve 21, can be construed as satisfying the “biased via an inward projection of the spring fingers” claim limitation.

Because the spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz* are not a portion of a single monolithic male connector body element and or alternatively because the spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz* are not biased to provide an interference fit upon the outer diameter surface, via an inward projection of the spring fingers, each and every element of

the invention fails to be disclosed, suggested or taught in the cited references.

Therefore, rejection of claims 1-4, 9-10, 12-19 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 5-8 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Arcykiewicz* in view of *Nelson* and further in view of *Plummer*. The Examiner supplies *Plummer* as an example of a spring finger ring upon the sleeve. As described in detail herein above, because the spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz* are not biased via an inward projection to provide an interference fit upon the outer diameter surface, and or alternatively because the spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz* are not an integral part of a monolithic male connector body, as described in detail herein above, each and every element of the invention fails to be disclosed, suggested or taught in the cited references. Therefore, rejection of claims 5-8 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Arcykiewicz* in view of *Nelson* and further in view of *Maury*. The Examiner supplies *Maury* as an example of an SMA or Type N connector. As described in detail herein above, because the spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz* are not biased via an inward projection to provide an interference fit upon the outer diameter surface, and or alternatively because the spring fingers of *Arcykiewicz* are not an integral part of a monolithic male connector body, as described in detail herein above, each and every element of the invention fails to be disclosed, suggested

or taught in the cited references. Therefore, rejection of claims 11 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper.

Having obviated each of the Examiners rejections, applicant respectfully requests that a notice of allowance be issued. Should the Examiner be inclined to issue an Official Action other than the notice of allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner first contact Applicant by telephone at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew Babcock, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 44517

Babcock IP, PLLC
PO Box 488
4934 Wildwood Dr.
Bridgman, MI 49106
Telephone: 269.465.6603
Fax: 269.465.6431